

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 ALFONSO MUNOZ ALEGRIA,

12 Petitioner,

13 v.

14 STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

15 Respondent.  
16

No. 2:17-cv-0802 DB P

ORDER

17 Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed an application for a writ of habeas  
18 corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, together with a request to proceed in forma pauperis. This  
19 court will not rule on petitioner's request to proceed in forma pauperis.

20 Petitioner is presently incarcerated at Sierra Conservation Center in Tuolumne County.  
21 He is serving a sentence for a conviction rendered by the Riverside County Superior Court.


22 The general rule with regard to habeas applications is that both the United States District  
23 Court in the district where petitioner was convicted and the District Court where petitioner is  
24 incarcerated have jurisdiction over the claims. See Braden v. 30th Judicial Circuit Court, 410 U.S.  
25 484 (1973). In the instant case, petitioner's conviction occurred in an area covered by the District  
26 Court for the Central District of California.

27 Accordingly, in the furtherance of justice, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 28 1. This court has not ruled on petitioner's application to proceed in forma pauperis; and

1           2. This matter is transferred to the United States District Court for the Central District of  
2 California. Id. at 499 n.15; 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d).

3 Dated: June 2, 2017

4  
5  
6   
DEBORAH BARNES  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

7 /DLB7;  
8 DB/Inbox/Routine/aleg0802.108a  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28